



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,140	10/22/2004	Richard Hugh Clark	TS7607 US	1942
Yukiko Iwata 7590 07/07/2009				
Shell Oil Company				
Intellectual Property				
P O Box 2463				
Houston, TX 77252-2463				
EXAMINER				
MCAVOY, ELLEN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/512,140

**Applicant(s)**

CLARK ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ellen M. McAvoy

**Art Unit**

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05 May 2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submissions: new claims, remarks and an IDS, filed on 5 May 2009, have been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 43-45, 48-51, 54-60, 63-72, 76-80, 84 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berlowitz et al (6,663,767).

Applicants' arguments filed 05 May 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Berlowitz et al ["Berlowitz"] disclose a diesel fuel blended fuel composition which comprises an undercut conventional diesel fuel and a Fischer-Tropsch derived diesel fuel in amounts ranging from 5 to 90 vol. % of Fischer-Tropsch derived distillate, and 90 to 5 vol. % petroleum distillate. See the claims. Berlowitz teaches that the blended fuel demonstrates better than expected emissions and reduced sulfur content when used in a diesel engine. See column 2, lines 17-63. The Fischer-Tropsch derived diesel fuel is set forth in

Art Unit: 1797

columns 3-4 wherein the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon distillate has a T95 of at least 600°F, more preferably the Fischer-Tropsch derived distillate has an initial boiling point of at least 300°F and a T95 of at least 650°F, even more preferably an initial boiling point of at least 320°F and a T95 of at least 700°F to 750° F. See lines 49-54 in column 4. The examiner is of the position that the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon distillate of Berlowitz meets the limitations of the Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil of the claims. The blended fuel composition was subjected to engine testing wherein the blended diesel fuel was compared to conventional petroleum diesel fuels. Berlowitz teaches that significantly lower emissions and particulate matter were produced from the diesel fuel blend when compared to two different conventional diesel fuels. See column 6, line 59 to column 7, line 40.

In response applicants presented new claims 43-85 which are essentially drawn towards a method of removing and/or reducing injector fouling and/or combustion related deposits in a diesel engine which comprises the step of combusting in the diesel engine a fuel blend comprising a sufficient amount of Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil to produce a cleaned diesel engine. Applicants argued that Berlowitz does not disclose such a method of removing and/or reducing injector fouling and/or combustion related deposits in a diesel engine. This is not deemed to be persuasive because the method of the independent claims essentially comprises the step of combusting in the diesel engine a fuel blend comprising an amount of Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil which is clearly taught by Berlowitz as set forth above. Although reducing injector fouling and/or engine deposits is not specifically set forth in Berlowitz, reduction of particulate matter is briefly discussed in column 7, lines 37-40, and it has been held that the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific

explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. See *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342,1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Further the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Thus the examiner maintains the position that Berlowitz meets the limitations of the above rejected claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 46, 47, 52, 53, 61, 62, 73-75 and 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berlowitz et al (6,663,767) in combination with Bacha et al (6,776,897).

Applicants' arguments filed 05 May 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Berlowitz et al ["Berlowitz"] is relied on as outlined above. Applicants' invention may differ in several of the dependent claims by adding a conventional additive, namely a detergent, to the diesel fuel blend which is not taught in Berlowitz. However, Bacha et al ["Bacha"] is added to teach that diesel fuel compositions containing Fischer-Tropsch derived diesel fuels may comprise conventional additives such as detergents. See column 5, line 48 to column 6, line 66. Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to have added a detergent to the diesel fuel blended composition of Berlowitz if its known imparted property was so desired.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen M. McAvoy whose telephone number is (571) 272-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-5:00) with alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ellen M McAvoy/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1797

EMcAvoy  
July 5, 2009